



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/026,151

12/19/2001

Ertugrul Berkcan

RD-28,476

8199

7590

10/06/2003

John S. Beulick
Armstrong Teasdale LLP
Suite 2600
One Metropolitan Sq.
St. Louis, MO 63102

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, JIMMY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2829

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/026,151

Applicant(s)

BERKCAN ET AL.

Examiner

Jimmy Nguyen

Art Unit

2829

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Argument

The amendment filed 7/10/03 has been considered with the following effect;

- i. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 10, 11, 20, 21, 29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 3 –10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bruchmann (US 6472878).

As to claim 1, Bruchmann disclose (fig 1) a current sensor for an apparatus comprising;

A conductor (12) comprising a slit (14) and a plurality of hall effect devices (42) inserted at least partially within slit (14), conductor (14) is configured to generate a magnetic field having a pre-determined shape, each hall effect device (42) configured to detect pre-determined shape and generate an output (fig 3).

As to claim 3, Bruchmann disclose (fig 1) the magnetic field has a pre-determined spatial dependence.

As to claim 4, Bruchmann disclose (fig 1) the hall effect device (42) output is substantially insensitive to magnetic fields having other than the pre-determined shape.

As to claims 5, 7, Bruchmann disclose (fig 1) the current sensor further comprise a plurality of hall effect devices (12) and separated by pre-determined distance

As to claim 6, Bruchmann disclose (fig 1) the hall effect device output comprises a non-linear component.

As to claims 8, 9, Bruchmann disclose (fig 1) the magnetic field comprises at least a first magnetic field component having a first direction and a second magnetic field component having a second direction different from first direction and the at least two magnetic field components having the same direction (this cause by the hall effect devices 12).

As to claim 10, Bruchmann disclose (fig 1) the combination of claims 1 and 8. Therefore, the rejection of claim 10 will base on the combination of claims 1 and 8.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bruchmann (US 6472878) in view of Dames et al (US 6414475)

As to claim 2, Bruchmann discloses (fig 1) the current sensor. However, Bruchmann do not disclose the current sensor using the residential electricity meter. On the hand, Dames et al teach the current sensor (1) using for the residential meter (20).

It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the current sensor of Bruchmann and use within the electricity meter of Dames et al for the purpose of sensing current in the power line.

5. Claims 11 –29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Plis et al (US 5854995) in view of Bruchmann (US 6472878)

As to claims 11, 12, 20, Plis et al disclose (fig 1) a residential electricity meter comprising a voltage sensor (110) and a current sensor (120). However, Plis et al is silent on the structure of the current sensor comprising a conductor comprising a slit and a plurality of hall effect devices inserted at least partially within slit, conductor is configured to generate a magnetic field having a pre-determined shape, each hall effect device configured to detect pre-determined shape and generate an output .

On the other hand, Bruchmann disclose (fig 1) a current sensor comprising A conductor (12) comprising a slit (14) and a plurality of hall effect devices (42) inserted at least partially within slit (14), conductor (14) is configured to generate a magnetic field having a pre-determined shape, each hall effect device (42) configured to detect pre-determined shape and generate an output (fig 3).

It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the current sensor within the electricity meter of Plis et al and use within the current sensor of Bruchmann for the purpose of sensing current in the power line.

As to claim 13, Bruchmann discloses (fig 1) the magnetic field has a pre-determined spatial dependence.

As to claim 14, Bruchmann discloses (fig 1) the hall effect device (12) output is substantially insensitive to magnetic fields having other than the pre-determined shape.

As to claims 15, 17, Bruchmann discloses (fig 1) the current sensor further comprise a plurality of hall effect devices (20,21) and separated by pre-determined distance

As to claim 16, Bruchmann discloses (fig 1) the hall effect device output comprises a non-linear component.

As to claims 18, 19, Bruchmann discloses (fig 1) the magnetic field comprises at least a first magnetic field component having a first direction and a second magnetic field component having a second direction different from first direction and the at least two magnetic field components having the same direction (this cause by the hall effect devices 12).


As to claims 21 – 29, In *In re King*, 801 F.2d 1324, 1326 USPQ 136, 138 (Fed. Cir. 1986) it was held that: "Under the principles of Inherency, if a structure in the prior art necessarily functions in accordance with the limitations of a process or method claim of an application, the claim is anticipated." The court

added, however, that: "This is not to say that the discovery of a new use for an old structure based on unknown properties of the structure might not be patentable to the discoverer as a process. *In re Hack*, 245 F.2d 246, 248, 114 USPQ 161, 163 (CCPA 1957)."

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jimmy Nguyen at (703) 306-5858. Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4900.

JN.
Sep 16, 2003



ERNEST KARLSEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER